

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/893,743	ISRAEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin C. Harper	2666	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kevin C. Harper. (3) Michael Messinger (Reg. No. 37,575).
 (2) Lori Gordon (Reg. No. 50,633). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15-19,21,22,24 and 27-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cruz et al. (US 2002/00758590) and Murphy et al. (US 6,282,192).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



4/30/04
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives briefly described the claimed invention and the references used in the previous office action. In order to advance the prosecution of the application, Applicant's representatives discussed with the examiner proposed changes to the claims to overcome the rejections of the previous office action regarding the Cruz reference. Examiner generally agreed that the proposed claim limitations overcome the rejections made in the previous office action but noted that a further search and consultation with a primary examiner would be required to determine allowability.



DANG TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER